

7/11

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following observations.

In the claims

The dependent claims are amended to recite “The series of value documents.”

Claims 3, 8, 12, 32, and 35 are additionally amended to correct informalities which were observed during the review of the claims. The amendment to these claims have been submitted to improve the clarity of the subject matter for which protection is sought. The amendment was not made to avoid prior art. Rather, in reviewing the claim language it was perceived that some of the language could be improved to more clearly define the inventive subject matter.

It is submitted that the amendment to the claims only corrects indefinite language as identified in the Office action and does not raise any new issues requiring further search or consideration.

No new matter is introduced by the amendment to the claims. Entry of the amendment to the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of the claims under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

Reconsideration of this amendment is kindly requested in view of the amendment to the claims 2-12, 14-17, 19, and 32-35 as discussed above.

It is submitted that the amendment to the claims makes the claims conform to 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Withdrawal of this rejection is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 32 under 35 USC 102(b) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the amendment to the claims and the following observations.

The remarks made with respect to *Bratchley* in the response filed on June 22, 2011 are still considered to be relevant and are hereby incorporated by reference.

In particular, it is submitted that *Bratchley* does not disclose a series of value documents, wherein at least one value document is an upgrade of the other value documents, the upgrade of the value documents of the series in addition to or instead of the first feature substance comprises a third feature substance, and the upgrade of the value documents is over originally-issued documents of value having the first feature substance and lacking the third feature substance as required by claim 1.

The claims are directed to a series of value documents, and in the series, which has at least two value documents, at least one of the value documents is an upgrade over originally-issued documents. The upgraded value document has a different structure from the originally-issued documents in that the upgraded document has a third feature substance in addition to or instead of the first feature substance. That is, the upgraded value document in the series compared to the originally-issued value documents in the series has different feature substances.

9/11

Bratchley does not contemplate a series of value documents and further does not disclose a series of value documents having an upgraded value document having different feature substances from originally-issued documents as required by claim 1.

Accordingly, *Bratchley* does not disclose all of the features of claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 32 depend from claim 1 and are patentable as containing all of the recited features of claim 1, as well as for their respective recited features.

Withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 7 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in view of EP 0 052 624 (*Kaule*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested in view of the dependency of claim 7 from claim 1. Claim 7 is considered patentable over the proposed combination of *Bratchley* and *Kaule* at least due to its dependency from claim 1 and its individually recited features.

Withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested in view of the dependency of claim 16 from claim 1. Claim 16 is considered patentable over *Bratchley* at least due to its dependency from claim 1 and its individually recited features.

Withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claims 33 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605
(*Bratchley*) in view of *Anti-Stokes Phosphors/Luminophors (ASPL)*

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested in view of the dependency of claims 33 and 34 from claim 1. Claims 33 and 34 are considered patentable over the proposed combination of *Bratchley* and *ASPL* at least due to their dependency from claim 1 and their individually recited features.

Withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is kindly requested.

Rejection of claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) over US patent 6,155,605 (*Bratchley*) in
view of US patent 5,169,155 (*Soules*)

Reconsideration of this rejection is requested in view of the dependency of claim 16 from claim 1. Claim 35 is considered patentable over the proposed combination of *Bratchley* and *Soules* at least due to its dependency from claim 1 and its individually recited features.

Withdrawal of this rejection of the claims is kindly requested.

Conclusion

As a result of the amendment to the claims, and further in view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that every pending claim in the present application be allowed and the application be passed to issue.

If any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephone or facsimile communication with the Applicant's attorney, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the numbers shown below.

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-1176
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

Date: September 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Justin J. Cassell/

JUSTIN J. CASSELL
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 46,205